Public Works (1899) Department.

G.O., No. 1042 J

DATED 11th Dec 1899.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Prosecution of the ryots of Peria Alangulam, Madura Dt.

The payment of Rs 100 to the Vakil who conducted the — sanctioned.

Indexed. DR 15/12

[P. W. 2. 500—27-10-99.]

Public Works (1899) Department.

CURRENT No. 9597 ~~106 M.D~~

From

The Supg Engineer
VI Circle

No. 1719 M.D.

Dated 16 November 1899

Received 27 + 8 do

Registered

Enclosures 2

Spare copies.

SUBJECT.

Prosecution of the ryots of Duriya alangulam — Requesting sanction to the payment of Rs 100 to the Vakil who conducted the ——

Order No: 1042 I dt 11-12-99.

The payment of Rs 100 to the Vakil who conducted the prosecution the result of which is recorded in Proceedings No. 587 I, dt 12 July /99, is sanctioned.

22/11/99

Issue

23/11/99

Papers

To
The Ch Engr for I.
Supg Engr VI.
Ex Engr P.W.D.

20/11/99

21/11/99

Despd
12/12/99

20/11/99

18/11/99

20-11-99

BACK PAPERS.

No.	Date.
R 3152	13.7-99.
R 5121	7-11-98.

FURTHER PAPERS.

No.	Date.

Copy of communication, dated 11th October 1899 from M.R.Ry P.N. Muthusami Aiyar B.A. B.L, High Court vakil, now Special Government prosecutor, Sankaranainarcovil, to the Collector of Madura.

With reference to your letter R.C.C. No: 2564/Gl of 1899, dated 15' September last, I have the honour to inform you that I was engaged in the case referred to therein by the Asst: Engineer, Tirumangalam Division, on the understanding that I should be paid Rs 25 per diem.

In that case I put in appearances as detailed below:—

1. 28" February 1899. Presented the complaint with the vakalat. Sworn statement taken and case posted to 11' March 1899-

2. 11th March 1899 - went to court, Sub-Magistrate was absent, case adjourned to 20' March 1899.

3. 20' March 1899 - Attended court, waited till the case was taken up. Summonses

to

to accused 1 and 2 not returned. Adjourned to 6' April 1899-

4. 6' April 1899 - Accused 1 and 2 absent. Adjourned to 17" April 1899

5. 17' April 1899 - Warrant ordered to first accused. Adjourned to 29' April 1899.

6. 29' April 1899 - Same accused absent. Adjourned to 8' May 1899.

7. 8' May 1899 - All accused present. Examined 6 prosecution witnesses. Other witnesses absent, Warrants ordered; adjourned to

8. 15' May 1899 - Remaining three witnesses were examined and the state-ments were taken from all accused, Case argued, charge framed, posted for defence evidence to 29" May 1899-

9. 29' May 1899 - Defence witnesses were examined, case argued and closed Judgment on

10. 1' June 1899 - Judgment not ready, judgment was pronounced on 2' June 1899 committing all accused.

In

In my first letter to the Assistant Engineer, I claimed Rs. 250. But he wrote to me to say that he believed a fee of Rs 25 would be charged for the days on which the case was actually gone into. Hence I subsequently charged Rs 100 for the 4 days in which the case was actually gone into.

In those 4 days, I was solely engaged in the case and I cannot now state for how many hours I had to wait each day in court, before the case was taken up; So I have roughly estimated my remuneration for the other days to be Rs 50-

I have the honour therefore to request you to be good enough to sanction payment of Rs 150- to me at an early date.

(Sd, M. Tirumalai Pillay
For Collector.
7-10-99.

(True copy)

P. V. Bradley Lt: Col: R.E.
Supg: Engineer, 6 Circle

[signature] 16/11/99

P.ce. Encl/959/99

18 NOV 1899

1/106 M.D.

From L. L. Buckley Esquire, Ag: Collector of Madura to the Executive Engineer, Madura Division D. Dis No: $\frac{2047}{Rev:}$ of 99 dated 6 November 1899 –

In reply to your letter letter No: 614 M, dated 28.8.99, I have the honour to enclose copy of MRRy. P. N. Muthuswami aiyar's letter to me, dated 11-10-99, giving particulars of the work done in connection with the case against the Sambakulam ryots and to state that a fee of Rs 25- for each of the three days (8th, 15th, & 29th of May 1899) occupied in the hearing of the case may be sanctioned besides an additional fee of Rs 25- for filing the complaint and for the vakil's appearance for short periods on the days on which adjournments were given owing to the absence of the accused &c. I consider that on the whole only a fee of Rs 100 may be sanctioned for the vakil's fee in the case.

2. The Vakil's letter received with the reference quoted above is also enclosed.

(True copy)

J. T. Bradley Lt. Col. R.E.

Supg. Engineer, 6 Circle.

16.11.99.

P.W. Ecn 2 / 9597/99

18 NOV 1899
7/106 MD.

No. 1719 Md.

OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
6TH CIRCLE,
Trichinopoly, 16 November 1899.

S/17-

From

Lt. Col. G. V. Boddy R.E.
Superintending Engineer,
6th Circle.

To

The Chief Engineer,
for Irrigation.

18 NOV. 1899
106 MD.

2 ENCLOSURES.

SIR,

With reference to G.O. Nos: 886 I & 587 I, dated respectively 11 November 1898 and 12 July 1899, I have the honour to forward herewith copy of letter No. $\frac{2047}{Rev.}$ of 99, dated 6 Novr. 1899, with copy of its enclosure, from the Collector of Madura to the address of the Executive Engineer, and to request that Sanction of Government may be obtained to the payment of Rs 100 to the vakil who conducted the prosecution of the ryots of Peria alangulam.

2. It will be observed from the pleader's letter to the Collector that he claims a fee of Rs 150-, but the latter officer recommends only a

sum

Sum of Rs 100-

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

your most obedient Servant.

[illegible] Lt: Col: R.E.

Supg: Engineer, 6 Circle